

Decay of Z into Three Pseudoscalar Bosons

E. Keith and Ernest Ma

*Department of Physics
University of California
Riverside, California 92521*

Abstract

We consider the decay of the Z boson into three pseudoscalar bosons in a general two-Higgs-doublet model. Assuming m_A to be very small, and that of the two physical neutral scalar bosons h_1 and h_2 , A only couples to Z through h_1 , we find the $Z \rightarrow AAA$ branching fraction to be negligible for moderate values of $\tan\beta \equiv v_2/v_1$, if there is no $\lambda_5(\Phi_1^\dagger\Phi_2)^2 + h.c.$ term in the Higgs potential; otherwise there is no absolute bound but very large quartic couplings (beyond the validity of perturbation theory) are needed for it to be observable.

If the standard $SU(2) \times U(1)$ electroweak gauge model is extended to include two scalar doublets, there will be a neutral pseudoscalar boson A whose mass may be small. In that case, the decay of the Z boson into 3 A 's may not be negligible. This process was first studied[1] in a specific model[2]. It was then discussed[3] in a more general context. More recently, it has been shown[4] that there is a lower bound on m_A of about 60 GeV in the Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model (MSSM), hence the decay $Z \rightarrow AAA$ is only of interest for models with two scalar doublets of a more general structure. Even in the context of supersymmetry, this is possible[5] if there exists an additional $U(1)$ gauge factor at the TeV scale.

In this paper we consider a general two-Higgs-doublet model and identify the conditions for which the decay $Z \rightarrow AAA$ may be enhanced, despite the nonobservation of $e^+e^- \rightarrow h + A$, where h is either one of the two neutral scalar bosons of the model. We will show that in principle this decay is limited only by the scalar coupling $\lambda_1 - \lambda_2$ as defined below. However, if $\lambda_5 = 0$, which is true in a large class of models[6], then it may be bounded as discussed below.

Let the Higgs potential V for two $SU(2) \times U(1)$ scalar doublets $\Phi_{1,2} = (\phi_{1,2}^+, \phi_{1,2}^0)$ be given by

$$\begin{aligned} V = & m_1^2 \Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_1 + m_2^2 \Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_2 + m_{12}^2 (\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_2 + \Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_1) + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_1 (\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_1)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_2 (\Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_2)^2 \\ & + \lambda_3 (\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_1) (\Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_2) + \lambda_4 (\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_2) (\Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_1) + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_5 (\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_2)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_5^* (\Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_1)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where the discrete symmetry $\Phi_1 \rightarrow \Phi_1$ and $\Phi_2 \rightarrow -\Phi_2$ is only broken softly by the m_{12}^2 term. Assume λ_5 to be real for simplicity. Define $\tan \beta \equiv v_2/v_1$ as is customary, where $v_{1,2} = \langle \phi_{1,2}^0 \rangle$ are the usual two nonzero vacuum expectation values. The pseudoscalar neutral Higgs boson is then

$$A = \sqrt{2}(\sin \beta \text{Im} \phi_1^0 - \cos \beta \text{Im} \phi_2^0), \quad (2)$$

with mass given by

$$m_A^2 = -m_{12}^2(\tan \beta + \cot \beta) - 2\lambda_5 v^2, \quad (3)$$

where $v^2 \equiv v_1^2 + v_2^2$, and the charged Higgs boson is

$$h^\pm = \sin \beta \phi_1^\pm - \cos \beta \phi_2^\pm, \quad (4)$$

with

$$m_{h^\pm}^2 = m_A^2 + (\lambda_5 - \lambda_4)v^2. \quad (5)$$

To get the maximum $Z \rightarrow AAA$ rate, we let $m_A = 0$, *i.e.*

$$m_{12}^2 = -2\lambda_5 v^2 \sin \beta \cos \beta. \quad (6)$$

Then the mass-squared matrix spanning the two neutral scalar Higgs bosons $\sqrt{2}\text{Re}\phi_{1,2}^0$ is given by

$$\mathcal{M}^2 = 2v^2 \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 \cos^2 \beta + \lambda_5 \sin^2 \beta & (\lambda_3 + \lambda_4) \sin \beta \cos \beta \\ (\lambda_3 + \lambda_4) \sin \beta \cos \beta & \lambda_2 \sin^2 \beta + \lambda_5 \cos^2 \beta \end{bmatrix}. \quad (7)$$

Consider now the following two linear combinations:

$$h_1 = \sqrt{2}(\sin \beta \text{Re}\phi_1^0 - \cos \beta \text{Re}\phi_2^0), \quad (8)$$

$$h_2 = \sqrt{2}(\cos \beta \text{Re}\phi_1^0 + \sin \beta \text{Re}\phi_2^0). \quad (9)$$

It is well-known that h_1 couples to AZ but not ZZ , whereas h_2 couples to ZZ but not AZ . However, the process $e^+e^- \rightarrow h + A$ is in general possible because h will normally have a h_1 component, thereby putting a constraint on m_A if kinematically allowed. For our purpose, we will require h_1 and h_2 to be mass eigenstates, in which case m_A is unconstrained by the nonobservation of $e^+e^- \rightarrow h + A$ even if m_2 is small, as long as m_1 is larger than the e^+e^- center-of-mass energy. This allows us to have the maximum effective coupling of Z to AAA as shown below.

The requirement that h_1 and h_2 be mass eigenstates leads to the condition

$$\lambda_2 \sin^2 \beta - \lambda_1 \cos^2 \beta + (\lambda_3 + \lambda_4 + \lambda_5)(\cos^2 \beta - \sin^2 \beta) = 0. \quad (10)$$

As a result, the masses of $h_{1,2}$ are given by

$$m_1^2 = [\lambda_1 \cos^2 \beta + \lambda_2 \sin^2 \beta + \lambda_5 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4]v^2, \quad (11)$$

$$m_2^2 = [\lambda_1 \cos^2 \beta + \lambda_2 \sin^2 \beta + \lambda_5 + \lambda_3 + \lambda_4]v^2. \quad (12)$$

Note that in the MSSM, Eq. (10) cannot be satisfied in the presence of radiative corrections.

We now extract the $h_1 AA$ coupling from Eq. (1), using Eqs. (2) and (8). We find it to be given by

$$\frac{\sin 2\beta}{2\sqrt{2}}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)v, \quad (13)$$

where Eq. (10) has been used. As a function of β , this expression is obviously maximized at $\sin 2\beta = \pm 1$. On the other hand, our conditions so far do not limit the combination $\lambda_1 - \lambda_2$, hence there is no absolute bound on $Z \rightarrow AAA$ in this general case.

Let us consider the case $\lambda_5 = 0$. This is natural in a large class of models where the two Higgs doublets are remnants[6] of a gauge model larger than the standard model such that they are distinguishable under the larger symmetry. In that case, we have

$$m_1^2 = 2(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4)v^2 \cos^2 \beta = 2(\lambda_2 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4)v^2 \sin^2 \beta, \quad (14)$$

and we can rewrite (13) as

$$-\frac{m_1^2}{v\sqrt{2}} \cot 2\beta. \quad (15)$$

The above expression appears to be unbounded as $\sin 2\beta \rightarrow 0$. However, that would require very large quartic scalar couplings. This can be seen two ways. First, since (15) is equal to (13), we need an extremely large value of $\lambda_1 - \lambda_2$. Second, from Eq. (14), we see also that if $\sin \beta$ is small, then $\lambda_2 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4$ has to be big, and if $\cos \beta$ is small, then $\lambda_1 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4$ has to be big. Thus we will choose moderate values of $\tan \beta$ in (15) for the following discussion.

In Figure 1 we show the diagram for the decay $Z \rightarrow AAA$ with an intermediate virtual h_1 . To maximize this rate, we minimize m_1 to be just above the maximum experimental

e^+e^- center-of-mass energy, which is 172 GeV up to now but will soon be 183 GeV. As for h_2 , it interacts exactly as the one Higgs boson of the standard-model, from which we have the experimental limit[7] of $m_2 > 65$ GeV. However, m_2 is not directly involved in the $h_1 AA$ coupling here. Note also that λ_4 by itself must be large and negative so that $m_{h^\pm}$ of Eq. (5) can be greater than $m_t - m_b$ for $m_A = 0$, so as to prevent the decay $t \rightarrow b + h^+$. This condition is not satisfied in the MSSM where $\lambda_4 = -g_2^2/2$, hence $m_A = 0$ is not allowed there[4].

Assuming $\lambda_5 = 0$ and using Eq. (15) with $m_1 = 180$ GeV and $|\cot 2\beta| = 1$ (*i.e.* $\tan \beta = 0.4$ or 2.4), we now calculate the $Z \rightarrow AAA$ decay rate, following Ref. [1]. The amplitude is given by

$$\mathcal{M} = g_Z \frac{m_1^2 \sqrt{2}}{v} \left[\frac{\epsilon \cdot k_1}{(p - k_1)^2 - m_1^2} + \frac{\epsilon \cdot k_2}{(p - k_2)^2 - m_1^2} + \frac{\epsilon \cdot k_3}{(p - k_3)^2 - m_1^2} \right], \quad (16)$$

where $g_Z = e/\sin \theta_W \cos \theta_W$, p is the four-momentum of the Z boson, and $k_{1,2,3}$ are those of the A 's. The effective coupling used in Ref. [1] is now determined to be

$$\lambda_{\text{eff}} = \frac{m_1^2 \sqrt{2}}{v^2} \simeq 1.5. \quad (17)$$

Using the estimate of Ref. [1], this $Z \rightarrow AAA$ rate is then about 1.0×10^{-7} GeV. Hence its branching fraction is about 4×10^{-8} which is clearly negligible. To obtain a branching fraction of 10^{-6} , we need $\cot 2\beta = 5$ (*i.e.* $\tan \beta = 0.1$ or 10). In this case, either $\lambda_1 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4$ or $\lambda_2 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4$ in Eq. (14) has to be about 53.5. If $\lambda_5 \neq 0$, then we cannot use Eqs. (14) and (15), but Eq. (13) is still valid. To obtain a branching fraction of 10^{-6} , we will then need $|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|$ to be about 53.5. Thus in both scenarios, one or more quartic scalar couplings have to be very large and beyond the validity of perturbation theory.

If h_1 and h_2 are not exact mass eigenstates, then there is an additional contribution from $h_1 - h_2$ mixing which is necessarily very small from the constraint of experimental data if

m_2 is below 172 GeV. The $h_2 AA$ coupling is given by

$$\frac{v}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\frac{m_2^2}{2v^2} - 2\lambda_5[1 - \sin^2 \beta \cos^2 \beta] \right). \quad (18)$$

If $\lambda_5 = 0$, this expression is bounded independent of $\tan \beta$ and the overall contribution (including the small $h_1 - h_2$ mixing) is negligible. If $\lambda_5 \neq 0$, then its value has to be huge for the process to be observable.

The reason that $\Gamma(Z \rightarrow AAA)$ is so small is twofold. One is that with the higher energy reached by LEP2, the nonobservation of $Z \rightarrow h + A$ forces m_1 to be much greater than M_Z . The other is that for $m_1 \gg M_Z$, the leading term in $\mathcal{M}$ vanishes because $\epsilon \cdot (k_1 + k_2 + k_3) = 0$, resulting in a very severe suppression factor[1]. Our conclusion is that the decay $Z \rightarrow AAA$ is not likely to be observable in a general two-Higgs-doublet model with parameters in the perturbative regime.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work was supported in part by the U. S. Department of Energy under Grant No. DE-FG03-94ER40837.

References

- [1] T. V. Duong and E. Ma, Phys. Rev. **D47**, 2020 (1993).
- [2] E. Ma, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 1981 (1992).
- [3] D. Chang and W.-Y. Keung, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 3732 (1996).
- [4] E. Keith, E. Ma, and D. P. Roy, hep-ph/9707512, Univ. of Calif., Riverside Report No. UCRHEP-T196 (July 1997).
- [5] E. Keith and E. Ma, hep-ph/9704441, Univ. of Calif., Riverside Report No. UCRHEP-T176 (April 1997); and references therein.
- [6] E. Ma and D. Ng, Phys Rev. **D49**, 569 (1994).
- [7] G. Mikenberg, in *Proc. of the 17th International Symposium on Lepton-Photon Interactions*, Beijing, China, August 1995 (World Scientific, Singapore, 1996), p. 593.

Figure Caption

Fig. 1. One of 3 diagrams for the decay $Z \rightarrow AAA$. The other 2 are obvious permutations.

